

1 Chief Judge Marsha J. Pechman  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
AT SEATTLE

10 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, ) NO. CR06-157MJP  
11 Plaintiff, ) GOVERNMENT'S REPLY TO  
12 v. ) DEFENDANT'S OPPOSITION TO  
13 HENRY ROSENAU, ) RENOTED MOTION FOR  
14 Defendant. ) AUTHORIZATION TO DEPOSE  
15 ) FOREIGN WITNESSES  
16 \_\_\_\_\_  
17  
18 The United States of America, by and through Jenny A. Durkan, United States  
19 Attorney for the Western District of Washington, and Susan M. Roe and Marc A. Perez,  
20 Assistant United States Attorneys for said District, and files this Reply to the Defendant's  
21 Opposition to the Renoted Motion for Authorization to Depose Foreign Witnesses.  
22  
23 A defendant's rights under the Confrontation Clause are powerful but not absolute.  
24 "A defendant's right to confront accusatory witnesses may be satisfied absent a physical,  
25 face-to-face confrontation at trial only where denial of such confrontation is necessary to  
26 further an important public policy and only where the reliability of the testimony is  
27 otherwise assured." *Maryland v. Craig*, 497 U.S. 836, 850 (1990). The general rule that  
28 a defendant may attend the deposition is not absolute. See, *United States v. Ali*, 528 F.3d  
210, 238-41 (4th Cir. 2008); *United States v. Medjuck*, 156 F. 3d 916 (9th Cir. 1998). In  
*Medjuck*, the Court approved of the deposition of a Canadian witness, when the

1 defendant was in custody in the United States and present at the deposition only  
 2 electronically. The *Medjuck* Court held that the “Confrontation Clause preference for  
 3 face-to-face confrontation may be avoided by resort to telephonic participation,” after the  
 4 government attempted unsuccessfully to secure the defendant’s actual, physical presence  
 5 at the deposition, *citing Christian v. Rhode*, 41 F. 3d 461 (9th Cir. 1994). Addressing the  
 6 use of such a deposition at trial, the *Medjuck* Court, at 920, stated “[w]here the  
 7 government is unable to secure a witness’s presence at trial, Rule 15 is not violated by the  
 8 admission of videotaped testimony so long as the government makes diligent efforts to  
 9 secure the defendant’s physical presence at the deposition and, failing this, employs  
 10 procedures that are adequate to allow the defendant to take an active role in the deposition  
 11 proceedings”); *United States v. McKeeve*, 131 F.3d 1, 7-8 (1st Cir. 1997); *United States v.*  
 12 *Gifford*, 892 F.2d 263-265 (3d Cir. 1989); *United States v. Kelly*, 892 F.2d 255, 261  
 13 (3rd Cir. 1990); *United States v. Salim*, 855 F.2d 944 (2nd Cir. 1988).

14 Most recently and *post-Crawford*, this line of cases was followed in *United States*  
 15 *v. Sapse*, 2011 WL 1576898 (D. Nevada April 2011).

16 ***Appropriateness of Videoconferencing***

17 In-custody defendant Rosenau is not able to attend depositions in Canada. The  
 18 Canadian government has declined to extend permission for Mr. Rosenau to attend the  
 19 proposed depositions in Canada. *See*, Exhibit 1, p. 1, ultimate paragraph. The  
 20 United States government attempted to secure Mr. Rosenau’s physical presence at the  
 21 depositions but, based on his prior actions, his pretrial release has been revoked and he  
 22 remains in custody in the United States. Even if Canada allowed Mr. Rosenau to attend  
 23 physically, there remains significant questions as to whether the United States Marshal  
 24 Service could retain custody of a prisoner in a foreign country.<sup>1</sup>

---

25  
 26       <sup>1</sup>The government has requested information on this issue from the USMS which is  
 27 consulting with its National Office in Washington, D.C. The government has not yet  
 28 received a response and ask the Court’s permission to file additional information, if  
 necessary.

1    ***Unavailability of Foreign Witnesses***

2       It is appropriate for the Court to allow the deposition of Zachary Miraback as an  
 3 otherwise unavailable and uncooperative government witness. Mr. Miraback's expected  
 4 testimony was central to the United States' original Record of the Case for Extradition.  
 5 However, in April 2009, Mr. Miraback was detained by Calgary Police in an incident  
 6 involving unlawful firearms. *See*, Exhibit 2, Calgary Police Report. In May 2009,  
 7 forensic testing revealed his DNA on gloves, and DNA consistent with his DNA on a  
 8 balaclava, seized at the scene. *See*, Exhibit 3, Synopsis, p. 3-4.

9       In late 2009, ICE Special Agent Jesse Miller, together with Calgary Police, met  
 10 with Mr. Miraback to discuss Mr. Miraback's ongoing obligation to cooperate.  
 11 Mr. Miraback refused to cooperate with either Canadian or U.S. law enforcement and the  
 12 United States was forced to file a Supplemental Record of the Case for Extradition of  
 13 Henry Rosenau, acknowledging Mr. Miraback's abandonment of cooperation. *See*,  
 14 Exhibit 4, Affidavit of SA Miller and letter.

15      Since that time, Mr. Miraback has been identified as a suspect in an ongoing  
 16 assault investigation in Calgary, has violated his Court imposed terms, and remains  
 17 antagonistic to police. *See*, Exhibit 5, Email of Detective Ken Carriere and Calgary  
 18 Police Report. At this time, there is no basis for believing that Mr. Miraback is a  
 19 cooperative witness for the United States government or that he would voluntarily appear  
 20 before this Court.

21      This Court previously has received a copy of the Order in *Rosenau v. Whelpley*,  
 22 Quesnal Registry 14781, which prevents Mr. Whelpley "from leaving Canada for the  
 23 purposes of entering the United States." Such prohibition renders him legally  
 24 unavailable.

25    ***STATUS OF MR. BOTTING***

26      The government takes no position on whether Mr. Botting physically may attend  
 27 the deposition hearings in Canada and, in fact, the government forwarded the information  
 28 of Mr. Botting's continued representation in post-extradition matters to Crown Counsel.

1 The government asks for clarification of his role during any deposition. That is, is he  
2 allowed to act as a criminal defense attorney, e.g. cross-examining witnesses or making  
3 objections, during the criminal proceedings.

4 **CONCLUSION**

5 The government requests the Court order the requested depositions as there exists  
6 a clear legal basis for each and that the Court find that Mr. Rosenau's attendance at the  
7 depositions shall be by videoconference, in light of his in-custody status and the foreign  
8 government's refusal to admit him for the depositions.

9 DATED this 15th day of March, 2012.

10 Respectfully submitted,

11 JENNY A. DURKAN  
12 United States Attorney

13 s/Susan M. Roe  
14 SUSAN M. ROE  
15 Assistant United States Attorney  
United States Attorney's Office  
700 Stewart Street, Suite 5220  
16 Seattle, WA 98101-1271  
Telephone: (206) 553-1077  
17 Fax: (206) 553-0755  
E-mail: susan.roe@usdoj.gov

19 s/Marc A. Perez  
20 Marc A. Perez  
21 United States Attorney's Office  
1201 Pacific Avenue, Suite 700  
Tacoma, Washington 98402  
22 Telephone: (253) 428-3822  
Fax: (253) 428-3826  
23 Email: Marc.Perez@usdoj.gov

1                   CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

2                   I hereby certify that on March 15, 2012, I electronically filed the foregoing with  
3 the Clerk of Court using the CM/ECF system which will send notification of such filing  
4 to the attorneys of record for the defendant.

5                   *s/ Kathleen M. McElroy*  
6                   KATHLEEN M. McELROY  
7                   Paralegal Specialist  
8                   United States Attorney's Office  
9                   700 Stewart, Suite 5220  
Seattle, Washington 98101-1271  
Phone: 206-553-7970  
Fax: 206-553-0755  
E-mail: Katie.McElroy@usdoj.gov